



NEWSLETTER



RECEIVED
SEP 20 1992

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE
FRASER VALLEY (LIBRARY)

October 1992

Vol. 18, No. 1

FACULTY & STAFF ASSOCIATION
FRASER VALLEY COLLEGE
33844 King Road, R.R. #2,
Abbotsford, B.C. V2S 4N2
Telephone: (604) 853-7441

IN THIS ISSUE

From the Editor	Page 1
Letters to the Editor	2
President's Report	3
Inter-local Committee on Degree Completion	6
Recommendations from Advanced Education Council's Report	8
C-IEA President Report	9
Report from First Faculty V.P.	10
Report from First Staff V.P.	10
Report from Second Staff V.P.	11
Report from Staff Grievance	11
Report from Faculty Grievance	13
How It Works: Lay-off Procedures	14
Report from J.C.A.C.	16
How It Works: JCAC Review Chart	17
Report from Agreement Chair	18
UCFV Womens' Network	18
Committee Election Results	19
Political Correctness (PC) & Education: Much Ado About Nothing	20

FSA NEWSLETTER

October 1992

From the Editor . . .

Welcome to the 1992 *FSA Newsletter*. Yes, it is a little late, not exactly a timely issue to welcome back veterans and welcome aboard new members. But having been on the job only for a couple of weeks, it took a bit of time to put together.

Your Newsletter

With the great changes taking place at UCFV, the influx of new FSA members, and the busy provincial scene, we are trying to re-think the *Newsletter* for future issues:

- move towards a more thematic organization that makes it easier to understand the background to issues and to understand how they are developing on several fronts;
- run brief stories on Executive members' backgrounds;
- try to avoid language unfamiliar to new members and those not on the Executive;
- run a series of "How It Works" articles to familiarize new members and reacquaint veterans with basic procedures such as those for grievances, elections, committee memberships;
- list FSA membership on various FSA, UCFV, and joint FSA-management committees.

Please tell us what you think of the *Newsletter*, what we are leaving out and what we could leave out, how it could be better organized, etc.

This Issue

Of course you should read it all; but in case you don't, here are some items not to be missed:

"President's Report" from Cheryl Dahl introduces the FSA and some significant provincial organizations and committees. Along with **"From the C-IEA President,"** it also briefly explains some momentous provincial developments.

In **"Report from First Staff V.P."**, Richard Heyman has some appropriate reminders about those of us who may tend to grouse at *others* for not doing their jobs. I can certainly plead guilty to that one.

Jane Antil in **"From the Staff Grievance Chair,"** describes some problems that we are attempting to solve in order to steady the career ladder for staff at UCFV.

Bob Smith's report, **"From the Faculty Grievance Chair,"** explains a couple of types of persistent grievances that have become increasingly important as we do more hiring. Bob also notes that since many FSA members perform some management functions, *we* are often the cause of grievances. Don't forget your FSA roles when you participate in administrative decisions.

Bob has also written **"Lay-Off Procedures"** for the *How It Works* series; unfortunately, these procedures may soon again become critical. If you do not have time right now to haul out your new copy of the *Collective Agreement* and follow Bob's clause-by-clause explanation, save the pages and include it with your *Agreement*, Article 18, page 37.

Dorine Garibay's "Report from J.C.A.C. Chair," (JCAC stands for Joint Classification Audit Committee, a joint FSA-management committee that monitors staff job classifications) also explains how an important part of the *Collective Agreement* works. Again, save it and include it with Article 21.5.1, page 57, of your *Agreement*. Staff job review will be crucial for many members when their jobs change as UCFV changes.

The work of the UCFV Equity Committee will be a major force this year as it helps us to look at our policies, procedures, and practices regarding women, First Nations people, visible minorities, and people with disabilities. Consequently, Ron Dart's article, "Political Correctness (PC) and Education: Much Ado About Nothing," is germane. As Ron explains, some of these

issues have provoked vociferous debate and worse in the U.S. The Equity Committee sees part of its task as enabling us to examine equity issues without being caught in these traps. In order for the Committee to succeed, we all need to make every effort to examine these often difficult issues without rancour.

Finally, thanks to Craig Toews for sending us a copy of his letter to management. Letters, announcements, articles, Professional Development Reports, cartoons, etc. are welcome, indeed, could be an effective way to address many of the critical issues we face this year.

Have a good Thanksgiving.

Paul Herman
The Republic of Yarrow

Letters to the Editor . . .

Copy of letter sent to UC Management

Over the years, many employees have taken advantage of the opportunity to work summer-hours. This involves banking hours throughout the year in order to take one day off per week in the summer. In some areas this privilege has been taken away by management in order to cover the empty spots caused by summer vacations.

We have all worked extra hard this summer to keep up with growth and tighter budgets. I realize it is hard to supply all areas with sufficient manpower during the summer, but revoking this tradition is not the way to reward hard work. The impact of this will be devastating on the morale of those of us who value this incentive. Surely there is a better alternative?

Craig Toews

President's Report . . .

First, for the benefit of new members, and perhaps some old ones, a few preliminary definitions.

What is the FSA? The FSA is the Faculty and Staff Association, your union. Every two years or so, representatives from the FSA sit down with the UC (University College) management and negotiate an agreement about what we'll be paid, what our workloads will be, what benefits we'll get, what voice we'll have in key decisions, how we'll be evaluated on our work, how we'll be laid off, what rights and protection we enjoy, our working conditions and so on. This agreement is called the Collective Agreement, a copy of which you will receive as soon as the University College finishes printing it.

Between negotiations, the workplace is monitored by the FSA and by management to ensure that the contract is being followed. Where a member feels that his or her rights under the agreement are being eroded, the member should contact the union for help in sorting out the problem. If you do contact the union, don't worry about losing control of your issue, the union rep will not do anything unless you know about it and consent to it. The person who usually handles such problems is the Grievance Chair, there is one for faculty and one for staff. The FSA represents employees in many other ways as well, ensuring, for example, that we are involved where decisions are made which affect us. We are unique in the province in that we combine both faculty and staff in one organization, where most colleges have two distinct unions, and in some cases three or four. This has allowed us to speak with a united voice.

We have enjoyed excellent labour relations at UCFV in the past. We have always had a high level of involvement from faculty and staff, and do our own bargaining with management. The executive is elected every year in the spring at a general meeting, and general meetings are usually called to discuss major issues. Executive meetings are open, minutes are posted, and meeting times are indicated on the UC meeting schedule. We always need more help, so if you're interested, let us know. The union office is located in the faculty area on the Abbotsford campus.

What is C-IEA? The College and Institutes Educators' Association is a federation of faculty unions, representing 17 institutions. We pay a substantial sum to C-IEA every year for membership. C-IEA lobbies at the federal and provincial level, devises policy on key issues, and provides a forum for debate on system-wide issues. There is no corresponding staff union federation.

What is the Advanced Education Council? The Advanced Education Council represents the Boards and senior management personnel from the colleges and university colleges. In many respects, it is C-IEA's counterpart on the management side. The UC (not the Union) pays a substantial sum to belong to this organization.

What legislation governs our institution? The UC functions under several Acts, but the most important is the Colleges and Institutes Act. This Act sets out what we are expected to provide, in a general way, in terms of programming, how we are governed, and how we are funded. The Minister

responsible for administering this Act is Tom Perry. The universities are governed under a separate Act, as is Open Learning Agency. The Colleges and Institutes Act is currently being revised to reflect, among other things, the emergence of the university colleges.

Preliminaries complete, here are some of the issues we must face in the coming months:

Centralized Bargaining. The NDP has appointed Judith Korbin, formerly a staff rep with the flight attendant's union and later with the management of CP Air, to head the Korbin Commission to investigate public sector labour relations in BC. The Commission has a broad mandate, but is particularly interested in bargaining in post-secondary education. The Commission sees three options: status quo, centralized bargaining, or two-tier bargaining, where issues such as wages, PD, classification and workload are bargained through a master agreement province-wide, and locals are left with everything else. Only the last two options are being considered seriously. Staff would be represented separately from faculty, whichever model is adopted.

The Advanced Education Council has been consulted, and Korbin met with faculty union presidents last spring. C-IEA has no official policy on the matter, but has moved toward a coordinated bargaining model with the Coordinated Bargaining Council, to which 8 of the 17 C-IEA locals belong. We don't belong. If we want to maintain our right to bargain locally, we will have to struggle to do so. There are, of course, pros and cons to the idea, but we have enjoyed largely positive labour relations locally, and in my opinion, would lose more than we gain by the plan. The BCTF have condemned the plan. A

forum for faculty and staff discussion of the idea will be planned as soon as possible.

Another Fraser Valley University. Tom Perry recently announced the formation of a committee to plan another university for the Valley. The committee has no representation of any kind from UCFV. I have joined with the Presidents of the faculty unions at Kwantlen and Douglas to revive the C-IEA Sub-committee on Access in the Fraser Valley. I'll keep you posted.

Human Resource Development: A Job for Life? The Human Resource Development Project, established by the provincial government to look at training and education needs in the province, is nearing completion, with a draft report due soon. One idea which will appear in the report is the proposal that faculty trade "productivity and flexibility" for life-long job security for a "faculty core" at each institution. Those faculty outside the core would have province-wide hiring priority. The idea of a province-wide bargaining system seems implicit in this proposal. We await the arrival of the draft report.

BC Training Adjustment Board: A Private Sector Grab? Established to allocate federal training funds, this body currently has no representation from public sector institutions, but representation from private colleges and trainers. The monies involved are substantial, and colleges rely on these funds. BC is home to the largest number of private sector training schools in the country. Clearly, some fuss needs to be made about this, but C-IEA has had little success in lobbying the government on this issue. In a related vein, the first private sector institutions have just joined C-IEA in a special local called Local 99. They are Royal

Oaks and Richmond College. The idea is to provide union protection for our colleagues in the private sector, and at the same time raise wages and benefits to the level where the public sector can compete for students and training contracts.

New College and Institutes Act: Faculty and Staff on the Board? Tom Perry has established two committees, one to devise a mandate statement for the University Colleges and one to map out a governance structure. Will we get a Senate? An elected or appointed Board? Will faculty be represented? Will staff? What happens to our existing structures, like UCAC and PAC? What will we be mandated to do, and what will we not? Will we remain an "open door" institution? All these questions are on the agenda. Unfortunately, faculty are poorly represented on the committees, and staff not represented at all. The FSA has contact both the Ministry and C-IEA with a protest. At last word, the Ministry has refused to increase faculty representation, but has agreed to add one staff rep to the governance committee. The executive of C-IEA will select which locals are represented, given the limited number of seats. Since the conclusions of these committees mean so much to us, we can only hope we end up represented. If we fail to get people on the committees, we will have to work closely with those who do get seats.

Mission Facility. Planning is proceeding for a facility in Mission which would be co-managed by the District, UCFV, and the School Board. A tri-partite steering committee has already hired a site planner, and three day-long sessions have been planned to discuss, among other things, how the co-management arrangement will work. There are several unions involved, raising

problems of jurisdiction and accountability. Again, I'll keep you posted.

Budget/Lay-offs? UCFV anticipates a significant budget shortfall in April, as the wage settlement kicks in. The Province is sending clear signals that more operating money will not be forthcoming. We have an agreement with the UC that no one with more than two years seniority will be laid off until April. We will likely hear about where the cuts will be made within the next month. We may be in the bizarre situation of welcoming people on staff who have just been hired and seeing long-term employees laid off, exactly the situation we all worried about when the University College was being planned. Clearly the solution is for the Province to provide sufficient funds to run the University Colleges properly; but with a huge provincial deficit looming, the forecast is not good. Given the numbers of students beating down our doors, the case we can make is obvious enough. C-IEA lobbies steadily for more resources for the whole system, and in this role does us a considerable service. The Advanced Education Council is also lobbying, and local Board members are visiting their MLA's on our behalf. Let us hope all this has some effect. The FSA will be contributing what it can to the effort, and also working to mitigate the impact of lay-offs locally.

Life in the Fast Lane. In addition to the above issues, the regular work of the union goes on, but the rate of change both internally and externally is straining our resources badly. We have 57 new members and more complex processes to serve a membership which now numbers about 500. New positions are being created, new committees, new kinds of grievances. We are represented on almost every committee in

the UC, and generally are asked to provide faculty and staff representation in any decision-making forum. We run elections constantly, and where time-lines make this impossible, appoint reps. My genuine gratitude to those of you who have agreed to serve on our behalf on various provincial and local committees.

The FSA executive assistant, Fenella Sobchuk, is by necessity working longer hours, and the FSA is currently working out with her a new employment contract. The release time arrangements for the President are proving inadequate, given the pressure for provincial changes we couldn't predict last spring, and I will be seeking additional release time. We are forced to spend money we didn't anticipate having to spend on travel in order to be represented where some of the decisions are being made, to get extra office help, and so forth.

We need to look at our own structures and processes to streamline our operation and

manage a larger and more complex organization, and at the same time involve the membership in some crucial decisions being made in the same way we have in the past. With committees multiplying like mushrooms, and everyone suffering the effects of rapid change and additional work, it will be a major challenge to keep our union accountable to its membership, and to maintain the high level of involvement we have always enjoyed. Whatever pressures you are facing, remember to take time to consider some of the "big" issues, and let us know what you think. We will provide forums in as many ways as possible. A general meeting of members will be called when we know more about provincial developments. The FSA executive will meet with Tom Perry when he comes October 19, and discuss, among other things, the poor representation of faculty and staff in the forums where our futures are being decided.

Cheryl Dahl
Office A319b, Local 4265

Inter-Local Committee on Degree Completion . . .

Last year the provincial association (CIEA) formed an Inter-local Committee on Degree Completion, which has been meeting regularly, if infrequently, and which has sponsored one conference. P.D. Chair Germaine Baril and I represented our institution at these meetings last year. On September 25/6, we once again attended a meeting in Vancouver, along with representatives from Okanagan, Malaspina, Cariboo, and New Caledonia (which is not a university college, but which is trying to

establish some kind of harmony with the newly-formed University of Northern B.C.)

You will already have read Cheryl Dahl's report, so you will know of the two committees on mandate and governance formed at the ministry level. Friday night's meeting was a discussion of these committees with Jim Soles from the Ministry. The first committee is to complete its work between October 22 and November 30, is to establish the terms for degree-granting in the university

colleges, and, he thought, should include representatives from the four university colleges. The second committee on governance is examining the Colleges and Institutes Act to make recommendations on changing the legislation, with a particular eye toward governance in all the colleges. Only four faculty representatives are allowed, to be chosen by CIEA. This work will begin its work in early November, with a completion date in January.

Soles responded to a series of questions. One of the most hopeful notes concerned a review of funding which would reconsider funding for years one to four at the university colleges, and also a possible increase for library funding. In addition, he seemed very open to faculty complaints about the very hierarchical nature of governance in the college system. He said the Ministry would be loathe to approve a system of Senates which emulated the university senates, cumbersome bodies which are very slow to change anything, but that increased faculty involvement and representation on Boards would certainly be considered.

Cheryl will have emphasized how crucial these committees are to the future shape of governance in our colleges. The CIEA representatives will be operating from the "CIEA Summary Position Paper: University Colleges" adopted at the annual general meeting in May of last year. A copy of this document is filed in the FSA office. If you wish to look at it, or to obtain a copy, contact Fenella in the FSA office.

Saturday's meeting was a discussion among representatives from the university colleges. We suggested priorities among the issues to be negotiated provincially. At Cariboo and Okanagan in particular, the priority seems to

be more support for scholarly activity; they suggested a provincial level research council which could grant some funding, if insufficient funds are built into the funding for our institutions. I was somewhat concerned in what I heard in these discussions that we would fail to carve out an identity separate from the universities. Faculty at both Cariboo and Okanagan often sound to me as though they would really like to be clones of UBC. They are already concerned with opening the door to graduate programs in some areas. Another priority at the other three university colleges was that middle-management positions be elected from among faculty on term appointments, to return to faculty positions at the end of those terms. We already have a possible prototype of this system with our current Associate Deans. There is also a legitimate concern that with a constant push for "access", simply increasing the number of students in seats, we will run headlong into problems with quality of offerings, especially given the limited funding for access--in other words, the same old problem of being constantly asked to do more for less.

The inter-local committee is to meet again sometime this fall in order to require that the representatives to the two Ministry-formed committees on mandate and governance report back. As faculty at UCFV, we must be informed and involved on a provincial level--not easy in the midst of teaching, planning, growing, and trying to live out our lives! We have to make certain that our voice is heard provincially, and that we give some thought to how we want such issues as changes in the structure of governance to be played out here at home.

Virginia Cooke
Past President

You may have seen stories in the media about recommendations for the College and Institute system in B.C., emanating from the Advanced Education Council's (AEC) report Access for Equity and Opportunity. Here are its recommendations. The complete report is available from the FSA Office.

1. The College/Institute/Agency system be expanded by 28,000 additional funded FTE spaces over the next five years (5,500 per year, or an average increase of approximately 7 per cent).
2. Priority be given for the expansion of career/technical and vocational training programs experiencing high student and employer demand (shortages of qualified workers), and for the development of "new" programs to meet emerging employment training needs in such areas as Software Development, Manufacturing and Communications Technologies, Quality Processes, and others.
3. The distribution of additional FTE spaces to the community college system be made based on an enrolment growth allocation model which takes into account objective and measurable criteria such as: percent of the total provincial population living in the region; actual and projected population growth; the college's enrolment capacity relative to the provincial average number of FTE per 1000 population; and, the number and growth of grade 12 students enrolled in the region.
4. Greater emphasis be given to the support of programs providing higher level skills training in mathematics, science and computer literacy.
5. A proportion of the additional FTE spaces be designated for new and expanded programs to meet the needs of the disabled, special needs and the multicultural communities.
6. The College/Institute/Agency continue to develop mid and long term enrolment plans supported by enrolment demand information, demographic, labour market and employment data for the population they serve.

From the C-IEA President . . .

As President of the College Institute Educators' Association, it is a pleasure to send greetings and wishes for a successful year to all faculty and staff at the University College of the Fraser Valley. The year will present many demands for all of you, but the excitement and challenges of expansion as a University College will provide many rewards.

For those of you who are new to UCFV, I would like to explain C-IEA's role as your provincial union. C-IEA was formed in 1980 and now represents more than 5500 faculty and staff at seventeen colleges and institutes in British Columbia. It provides both labour relations and professional services. C-IEA's affairs are directed by the Presidents' Council which consists of each local president and six provincial officers. Policies are set at the annual convention by the delegates of the locals. C-IEA then articulates the policy, as the provincial voice of faculty.

This year C-IEA will be actively pursuing faculty and staff interest in three major initiatives which have the potential to markedly change the college/institute system: the Human Resource Development Project, the establishment of the British Columbia Training and Adjustment Board, and the report of the Korbin Commission on labour relations in the public sector.

The HRD report will culminate a two year review of the post secondary system in B.C. with recommendations designed to move the system forward for the next ten to twenty years. The report is not expected to

recommend specific actions, but will discuss directions for the system. It is expected the report will result in further expansion and change in the college and institute system.

The British Columbia Training and Adjustment Board, the provincial Labour Force Development board, will become the new mechanism for distribution of federal training money. At this time, a steering committee is working on the composition and terms of reference for the board which will in turn profoundly affect the training dollars colleges and institutes receive in the future. C-IEA is actively lobbying to reduce the potential of the board becoming a means to further privatize education and training in B.C.

The Korbin Commission was charged by the government to review the public service and labour relations in the public sector. The commission's attention has recently turned to the college and institute system. It is too early to speculate on possible outcomes of this commission report, but it will have a close look at current labour relations practice and make recommendations for the future. C-IEA, along with other unions in the college and institutes system, will be meeting with the commission in October.

There is little doubt these initiatives will affect you directly. C-IEA will put its efforts into ensuring the effects are positive ones. You can contribute by being active in your local association.

Kathy Conroy
President
College Institute Educators' Association

Report from First Faculty V.P. . .

One of the major issues for UCFV this year will be "Equity". The Board has declared 1992/93 the "Year of Equity", and to that end, is sponsoring a number of initiatives and activities. An Equity Committee is planning a P.D. day for January, and UCAC (University College Advisory Council) will be examining college policies and practices in the light of "Equity". Carol Hardy

(Management rep) and I (FSA rep) will be attending an Equity Conference at the end of October.

Tom Davis and I (Faculty V.P.s) will be representing your interests as FSA reps on UCAC this year. If you have any issues or concerns that should be brought to UCAC, call Tom at 4248/8042, or me at 4277/2824.

Anne Knowlan

Report from First Staff V.P. . .

We are moving through a new era in the life of our institution. Now that we are a University College we will be seeing a great many changes within a great many constants. In Abbotsford, the number of classrooms has not only expanded, it has also shifted. The "many" classrooms that used to exist in Building A have been transformed into departments, and offices with the result that a great many classes are now being offered in the new E Building.

The addition of 3rd & 4th year courses has obviously required the hiring of more staff and faculty to handle the extra demands placed on all our services from the President's department to the maintenance department and all other points throughout the process. The inconvenience to students in Abbotsford is still being felt keenly and will be for a while as construction carries on virtually around the clock in order to bring together the plans and needs that provide for

the wide variety of programs that UCFV encompasses.

At this moment, when the dust is still in the air, you should take a small moment and think about the requirements of your department. Regardless of all this expansion and change, there still exists one constant that can always be counted on, the demand for our time. Everyone it seems, is working to the maximum of their capacity, and beyond. Facilities is going crazy with its 400 plus bosses giving them information about classrooms, as well as complaints about non-functioning plugs, or construction workers who are making too much noise. The library is having to scramble in order to get more books on the shelves to better support the requirements of 3rd and 4th year courses. Student Services/Records and Registration are having to answer a greater variety of questions as students prepare for two more years at UCFV. The couriers and

maintenance department are handling all the items ordered during the summer as well as moving and adjusting offices to accommodate the new occupants. The administration is having to tread carefully through all the potential minefields as classes get underway and problems requiring immediate solutions flood in.

Who is to resolve all these dilemmas? We all have to. Every department, every position in the University College has to be responsible. Each of us has a role and a duty; and each of

us is critical in the scheme of things. If you feel you are more important or if you feel you are less important than others, don't. You are not! No one area or employee is more important than another. If one person does not do a job then everyone suffers. If blackboards don't get cleaned, if class outlines don't get done, if an instructor doesn't prepare, then the student suffers. Although people are paid unequally, there is no reason to see the responsibilities, or the individual, as less or more equal.

Richard Heyman

Report from the 2nd Staff V.P. . . .

With the onslaught of new staff positions and the expansion of our UCFV employee population in general, there has been a significant revamping of shop steward areas. The revised areas reflect a better balance and consistency between campuses and a unity among varying levels of staff members. The newly created areas are less job-specific, but members should be aware that they can

nominate out-of-area members to sit on SACs.

Elections for new shop stewards will be held in October followed by workshops to familiarize shop stewards with the entire Selection Committee Advisory process and other related union duties. New lists of member allocation areas will be distributed in October.

Pam Mercer

From the Staff Grievance Chair . . .

First off, I would like to thank Pam Mercer and Richard Heyman for carrying on with grievance issues while I was off for the summer.

Since the resolution of the Chilliwack Bookstore issue last spring, there have been no extraordinary complaints from staff. There is however one nagging concern that

seems to reoccur every now and then, and which has led to a policy grievance. This is the issue of job posting, job description, SAC criteria, and the questions asked by some SACs. All of these should mesh. The job posting is a very brief description of duties and qualifications for a particular position. The job description (in some cases this seems to be nonexistent) should flesh in the posting, but not change its qualifications or intent. The job posting should state the minimum qualifications necessary for the position. For example: If experience in advising students is necessary, but a degree or diploma is not, then the job posting should not make a degree or diploma a qualification. On the other hand when an internal applicant has applied for a position, and this applicant meets the minimum requirements as posted, and has a good job record with the apparent ability to carry on in this new position, it is extremely annoying to find that an outsider gets recommended by the SAC because she or he is "overqualified" for the position. How is staff supposed to climb up a career ladder, when there is no real opportunity to do so? Regarding this issue, I would like to give credit to Mark Hoffmann, as a manager, who cared enough when there were three internal applicants for a student advisor position that called for a bachelor's degree, that he did not short list the many external candidates with masters degrees, since as Mark put it, "They

are overqualified for this position." Unfortunately some of our managers do not care enough about the staff who work at UCFV to value our capabilities and experience. This leads to a feeling of being devalued.

Managers who are hiring must take more care in seeing that the job posting and the SAC criteria are complementary. The former builds on the latter. The two MUST NOT contradict or emphasize different qualifications. When this happens it is unfair to those who applied, and those who may have applied if they knew, for example, that although computer skill was stressed in the posting, what the SAC really felt was important was people skills. In carrying on this theme, it is then important that the questions asked in interview are in line with the SAC criteria. Personnel is now demanding that the SAC criteria be presented to them before the release of applications for a position. This is to enforce the idea that SAC criteria must fit the posting.

This issue of consistency in posting, SAC criteria, and interview questions is being addressed by both Personnel, who are now sitting on each SAC committee in which there are internal staff applicants, and by the FSA who have formed a committee to look at SAC procedures, and make recommendations. Fairness to our current staff is the main concern.

Jane Antil

From the Faculty Grievance Chair . . .

The FSA is currently grieving the conversion of a traditional Type C position to degree completion status, the latter requiring new qualifications, Ph.D., scholarly accomplishments, and first through fourth-year course offering capabilities. This had the effect of undermining the preference for selection that the C incumbent had earned after two years in the C position that was converted. The FSA has no objection to the SAC's actions, only with the posting requiring much different qualifications than have ever obtained in Article 31.4(a) conversions.

This case is a new twist on an old story. Article 31 is a difficult set of clauses to understand and administer, a subject of recurrent grievances. It's a good rule in contract maintenance to earmark those provision in the collective agreement that are contested and do something about it, if only to avoid time-consuming wrangling in the future. I believe the FSA executive, as a whole, sees the general problem and will try to remedy it, one way or another, with the College.

Another persistent type of request by members for FSA intervention concerns departments or program areas where consultation lags or where part-time employees are hired without advisory

procedures. As a rule, the FSA stays out of departmental business for the simple reason that most departments set up a consultative climate and differences are debated in a professional manner. Department heads are expected to enable and support. Most heads do this; a few, however, hire part-timers without benefit of procedure and in general do not seem to be able or willing to encourage consultative processes or common problem-solving. Members who object have a right to enlist FSA support, as there are some contractual provisions involved. The overwhelming majority of FSA members has always demanded that the FSA promote and enforce the consultation principles cited frequently in the collective agreement. Related is the fact that most grievances are caused by ourselves, those charged with managing responsibilities.

Appearing elsewhere in this issue is "Layoff Procedures", an attempt to clarify, step-by-step, Article 18. Like Article 31, 18 is complicated, but the College and FSA have a very good, in fact, excellent record of administering it properly. "Layoff Procedures" appears now because we have been put on notice, more or less, that the economic value of the collective agreement may exceed the college's income and that some "restructuring" may ensue towards the end of fiscal '92-'93.

Bob Smith

How It Works . . .

clip and save:

LAY-OFF PROCEDURES

When the College reduces or eliminates an employee's hours of work against his/her free will, the lay-off procedures in Article 18 of the Collective Agreement apply. The Faculty and Staff Association assigns an officer to assist and represent every employee on lay-off notice and to ensure that the employer fulfils its obligations.

The College's obligations

The College must provide a reason for a lay-off consistent with 18.1(b), giving notices of varying lengths (18.4 and 18.5). When selecting employees for layoff, the College must follow the order of seniority within employee categories listed in 18.3(c) and provide bumping (18.6), recall (18.7 - 18.9), or severance pay (18.15) options.

Throughout these procedures, these employees are still covered by the Collective Agreement and are entitled to FSA representation.

Who has lay-off rights?

Type A and B contract employees have full access. Type C employees do not have only the notice provision and order of lay-off protection. Regular part-time employees have a few rights, depending on their status (probationary or non-probationary) and length of service. Only those r.p.t.'s hired before 1 April 1990 have bumping rights. Sessionals have no lay-off rights and auxiliaries are not in the bargaining group.

Notice Periods

These notices provide the employees involved the time to assess their options and secure assistance from their FSA representatives. The time allotted allows the FSA to scrutinize the College's reasons for lay-off, to see that the order of lay-off has been followed, and to discuss alternatives with the College.

Bumping

Employees on lay-off notice may choose to bump into another position where the employee is qualified, is more senior than the incumbent, and the position's pay is equal or less than the employee's position that was reduced or eliminated. Staff may only bump into staff positions, faculty only into faculty positions (see also 18.6c).

Bumping usually follows this procedure: after referring to the seniority list and relevant job descriptions, the employee on notice writes to the College, citing the position(s) into which he/she wishes to bump and including a resume of qualifications. The College requires the employee to announce his/her intentions within five work days of receipt of notice (18.6(b)iv). The employee's letter should be reviewed by the FSA rep.

The College then rules on the employee's qualifications, usually following an interview with the employee. The FSA rep is entitled to attend. The College must assess the employee's ability to meet the minimum or

threshold qualifications of the position(s) selected by the employee. If the employee does not meet them, the College is obligated to determine if the qualifications could be met within a training period (18.6c). Note that this employee is not required to present higher or even equal qualifications than the employee subject to bumping. This isn't a competition, as in Article 13.5 situations. The purpose of bumping is job security for the more senior employees. When less senior employees are bumped, they then have the same right to bump in turn.

When the bump is successful, the employee can be required to serve a non-initial probationary period (see Article 14.4.b) This employee can reassume his/her original position within fifteen months if it is recreated or falls vacant.

Recall

If an employee on lay-off notice cannot bump successfully and there are no vacancies available for which he/she is qualified, recall is a fair alternative. Recall rights include the possibility of returning to his/her original position or being offered a position for which he/she is qualified. During the 15-month period, the College is obliged to notify the employee of these offers. The employee maintains benefits, accrues seniority, and continues to be represented by the FSA. The employee is free, of course, to work elsewhere. He/she can also apply for professional development funding or request tuition be waived when enrolling in a college course.

Severance Pay

Article 18.15 is cut and dried. The employee on lay-off notice must forego all other options

if he/she wishes a pay-out. This employee could return to the college, but would have to compete as an external candidate and start all over again.

Observations

Lay-offs devastate most employees and impair production. Multiple lay-offs, involving employees with substantial seniority inevitably touch off chain reactions of bumping as in 1991 when bumps went to the fifth round. This decision, despite the presence of alternatives, broke up several work teams that had been carefully assembled over many years. The College in this case invoked its authority to waive the "last hired, first laid off" principle (18.2), for dubious advantage. In another multiple lay-off situation, the College had no choice, as it had lost the bid to renew a major contract with a federal government agency.

The reasons for or justice of lay-off aside, the FSA and College have almost always produced the best results afforded by the procedures laid down. If the same effort were applied to the co-administration of the entire Collective Agreement, disputes between the two parties would be extremely rare.

Finally, if the lay-off procedures seem complicated, it is because they attempt to bridge two irreconcilable aims: the understandable desire of employees for job security and the employer's preference for complete discretion to reduce the workforce. The Collective Agreement gives the employer what it wants at the end of the day; most, but not all, employees will get what they want, if they clear all the hurdles.

Bob Smith

Report from J.C.A.C. Chair . . .

It has come to my attention lately that a lot of staff are not aware of the procedures to follow in requesting a review of their position. This has resulted in reviews being requested but that request not being acted upon with the time allowed. Since most staff go through this procedure only a few times in their years here, it is understandable that confusion exists. A form was devised a few years ago (the Job Classification Review Chart) that should answer some of the questions. I have asked that the form be copied and put in this Newsletter. Please rip it out and save it until you need it. If you lose it, or need other copies, please get in touch with your shop steward or the JCAC Chair.

When you request a review, it must be in writing and give a few examples of changes you see in your duties. After you send that

letter to your supervisor, use the Job Classification Review Chart to make sure that your job reaches the Personnel Director within twenty-five working days. (If your job is re-classified to a higher pay group, you will receive retro-active pay from the date of the first JCAC meeting after the Personnel Director receives the request.)

The FSA Executive would like to monitor the length of time it is taking for a request for a review to reach the Personnel Director.

**FROM NOW ON, WOULD YOU PLEASE
SEND A COPY OF YOUR REQUEST
FOR A REVIEW TO THE JCAC CHAIR.**

If you have any questions, don't hesitate to call me, or any other committee members:
Faye Hyndman, Maureen Mager, Cameron Roy.

Dorine Garibay
JCAC Chair

How it Works . . .

clip and save the Job Classification Review Chart on the following page:

JOB CLASSIFICATION REVIEW CHART

- (a) To be completed by staff requesting a review of job duties
- (b) To accompany the review request submitted to the Personnel Director

Article 19.9 of the Collective Agreement outlines the steps to be followed before a job description is reviewed by the Job Classification Audit Committee. In order to avoid delay, it is recommended that the incumbent and supervisor read Article 19.9 and obtain the relevant signatures at each stage of the process.

19.9 Review of Job Duties

- (a) An employee may request that his supervisor review his job description to determine its adequacy. Such a request shall be in writing. The supervisor shall review the job duties with the employee. After consultation with the supervisor, the appropriate senior administrator shall give a written response to the employee within ten (10) work days from the date the supervisor receives the request.
- (b) If the response recommends a change in the job description, the change shall be completed and the appropriate senior administrator shall approve or not approve in writing a change in the job description within ten (10) work days of the decision to review.
- (c) If the senior administrator approves a change in the job description, he shall forward the appropriate material to the Job Classification Audit Committee within five (5) work days.

DATE sent to Supervisor		Incumbent
DATE received by Supervisor		Supervisor
DATE received by Director		Director
DATE change approved		Senior Administrator
DATE sent to Personnel Director		

Report from the Agreement Chair . . .

Given the time of year, this report is, of necessity, brief. The Collective Agreement is now in the process of printing and distribution. The Agreement Committee has met once, and agreement has been ratified on the Nursing Workload issue, negotiated by way of Letter of Agreement between management and an elected committee of nursing colleagues with the able assistance of Bob Smith. This was ratified, subject to a minor clarification, by the instructors involved.

Management has also agreed to a change in the mileage rate effective October 1st; the new rate will be 30 cents per kilometre.

The college management has indicated its intention to discontinue summer hours for staff, effective the end of the summer period, 1993. The rationale appears to centre on a lack of "coverage" that now occurs in the summer period, occasioned increasingly by the growth of the college and the consequent staffing demands during the summer period.

Over the past few years, there has been a marked decrease in the number of staff enabled to take summer hours. In our 1990 negotiations, management agreed that area managers would provide reasons for denying employees a summer hours arrangement, and the effect of their notice now is to end this practice. Flexible hours as provided in the collective agreement are not at issue and are not at risk.

Over the course of this coming year, the FSA will seek specific evidence of the above-noted "coverage" problem to continue to preserve the summer hour arrangement where no problems are encountered.

I have established the practice of filing all Agreements materials and Agreement Meeting minutes with the FSA office for the perusal of any interested member. Please feel free to discuss any concerns you have with either Fenella or me.

Ian McAskill

UCFV Women's Issues Network (WIN) . . .

The UCFV Women's Issues Network held its first meeting of the new year at noon on Monday, September 21. Susan Witter kicked off the meeting by updating the group on the progress on the Year of Equity Committee and invited input from the group. After a review of upcoming conference/workshops of interest, the group brainstormed potential activities and directions for the year ahead.

Among the priorities for the year were sharing concerns and supporting each other in

problem-solving, educating ourselves about women's issues, and sharing that information with the broader community. Pam Mercer, Linda Toews, Leslie Wood, Fenella Sobchuk and student, Melissa Marchinko, agreed to join Susan Witter, Marg Penney and Jean Ballard-Kent in planning this year's activities. Please contact any of them for more information.

Marg Penney

COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS***FSA Executive Positions:*****SECOND FACULTY V.P. Tom Davis****COMMUNICATIONS CHAIR Paul Herman*****Non-regular Faculty Committee:*****Mark Kusnir****Hazel McIvor****Moirra Gutteridge****Lesley Dance****Deborah Longhurst****Lyn Savage (appointed)*****Faculty Evaluation Committee:*****Jean Ballard-Kent****Ian McAskill****Kevin Busswood (appointed)**

Political Correctness (PC) and Education: Much Ado About Nothing . . .

In 1991, when D. D'Souza's book, Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus was published, it merely stirred the placid waters of intellectual life on the surface. D'Souza's point was simple, and he presented it in a clear way: he argued that education has been taken captive by ideologues who only fly the flag of certain trendy issues; these ideologues equate education with their limited agendas, and, worse yet, their interpretation of things. In short, the liberal notion of a broad background in the humanities has been subverted by ideologues who dismiss the past and vigorously promote, in a simplistic way, their perspectives on race and sex. D'Souza calls this attitude toward education illiberal, and he argues it is ideological reductionism (ideology being defined as intellectual goose stepping on an issue or agenda).

D'Souza and his intellectual opponents, the advocates of PC education, both trip over some substantial points, though. D'Souza insists that his opponents are one eyed ideologues, and he and his tribe represent the true, nobler and broader view of education. We might want to ask D'Souza if he is not an ideologue in his own right. Are not D'Souza and family misinterpreting the tradition and creating their own PC brand of education? D'Souza has an irritating way of defending a rather elitist view of liberal education. This brand of education tends to celebrate Columbus and his exploits, turn its back on the poor, ignore the third world, gloss over the feminist challenge, and slips into a silly form of first world patriotism and imperialism.

D'Souza fails to mention that he, like Allan Bloom (The Closing of the American Mind), and Frances Fukuyama (The End of History and the Last Men) represent large American right wing think tanks. Bloom was a founding member of the Madison Centre, and the Madison Centre, the Olin Foundation and the American Enterprise Institutes (AEI) gave grants for the publication of D'Souza's book. Fukuyama, a member of the Rand Foundation and a former student of Bloom, has created quite a commotion with The End of History. The book is a slick and sophisticated apologia for liberal paternalism and American imperialism. It is understandable why some people react to D'Souza, Bloom and Fukuyama, given their ideological orientation.

D'Souza is right when he complains that there are ideologues on campus who demand adherence to their modern dogmas, but he fails to see that many of these PC advocates are merely reacting, and rightly so, to D'Souza's brand of education. Both D'Souza and those he equates with a PC view of education lack a deep view of the Classical tradition; this is why the debate merely rages on the surface and never reaches a serious level of dialogue. If D'Souza's view of education is truly the traditional and liberal one (which is questionable even within a liberal outlook), then the advocates of PC education should protest. But, if D'Souza's interpretation of tradition is incorrect, and his opponents naively, yet foolishly equate his view of education with tradition, then we have a real problem. It is quite easy, for anyone trained in the Western and Eastern traditions, to point out the many flaws in

D'Souza's perspective. His opponents, though, have often equated D'Souza's view of education with tradition, jettisoned them both, then found themselves with no firm ground to stand on.

The debate that has raged between D'Souza and the various defenders of PC education is much ado about nothing. Those who assault the Classical past rarely have a substantial understanding of it, and those who insist they are defending the past usually distort and trivialize it. A serious dialogue about Tradition and Modernity, in our day, is difficult because so few people have a thorough grasp of Tradition; it is too simplistic to idealize or dismiss it: There are few, also, who have seriously faced the prejudices of Modernity.

A meaningful dialogue about the past must begin with a clear understanding of the difference between Tradition, traditions and traditionalism. Traditionalism is, of course, the constriction of a tradition within the Tradition. D'Souza is very much an able and ready apologist for traditionalism, and, as such, should be viewed as a symptom of decadence rather than taken seriously. Those who differ with him, rather than turning away from Tradition, should take a hard look at the past; they might just find a reservoir of insight that will nourish them in a very deep and meaningful way. The task of trekking to the ancient springs is thick with all sorts of interpretive dangers, but those who refuse the journey forfeit the wisdom the hike offers.

Ron Dart

Canadian Association Against Sexual Harassment in
Higher Education
Association canadienne contre le harcèlement sexuel
en milieu d'enseignement supérieur

announces

The 8th annual conference of the
Canadian Association Against Sexual
Harassment in Higher Education

November 11-14, 1992
The Empress Hotel
The Victoria Conference Centre
Victoria, B.C.

This conference will be of interest to policy makers, harassment
advisors and human resources personnel from universities, colleges
and other post-secondary institutions, government, business and
unions. The program will include discussion about and responses to
the emotional cost of sexual harassment to complainants, the
financial cost to employers, unions and institutions, the personal
cost to respondents and the ultimate cost to society.

To receive registration information, please contact:

Conference Services
University Extension
P.O. Box 3030
University of Victoria
V8W 1N6
Fax: (604) 721-8774

For further information contact:
Professor Barbara Whittington
University of Victoria
School of Social Work
Phone: (604) 721-8044/Fax: (604) 721-8570

or Sheila Devine
University of Victoria
Director of Equity Issues
Phone: (604) 721-8486/Fax: (604) 721-8570

FSA Executive 1992/93

President	Cheryl Dahl	4265
Past President	Virginia Cooke	4293
First Faculty Vice-President	Anne Knowlan	4277
Second Faculty Vice-President	Tom Davis	4248
First Staff Vice-President	Richard Heyman	4333
Second Staff-Vice President	Pam Mercer	4283
Grievance Chair (Faculty)	Bob Smith	2421
Grievance Chair (Staff)	Jane Antil	4583
Contract Chair	Perla Werk	4363
Treasurer	Kathy Gowdridge	4579
Recording Secretary	Diane Griffiths	4282
Communications Chair	Paul Herman	2421
JCAC Chair	Dorine Garibay	4581
JPDC Chair.....	Germaine Baril	4291
Agreements Chair	Ian McAskill	4299
Occupational Health & Safety	Cheryl Isaac-Clark	4576

C-IEA REPS

Status of Women	Jean Ballard-Kent	4363
Human Rights	Jacalyn Snodgrass	4308
Non-Regular Faculty	Maira Gutteridge	4308